



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

there to show that Dioscorus pronounced a sentence of excommunication against Pope Leo.

We will show farther on, that the copy, in the acts of the councils, is the true and genuine one. We ask now, what was the motive for omitting in the copy, which Pope Leo is said to have sent to France, all mention of these things?

The reason is plain. The Pope of Rome now claims the primacy over the whole Church; and it is awkward to let it appear that, in claiming this primacy, the Pope of Rome is only doing what the worst and most vicious of the archbishops of the other patriarchal sees did also. So the well-skilled forger, who made the copy, struck that out, because it looked ill. Again, the Pope now claims power to excommunicate all other bishops and archbishops, but no archbishop is to have power to excommunicate the Pope; but in this sentence it does appear that Dioscorus, of Alexandria, did excommunicate the Pope. In fact, this was a common thing in the ancient Church; if two worldly-minded and ill-tempered bishops quarrelled, they excommunicated each other; and it made no manner of difference in this proceeding, if one of them was Bishop of Rome. But in after ages it was thought a very ugly thing, to let it be seen, that in ancient times other bishops did take as much liberty in excommunicating the Pope, as the Pope took in excommunicating them; and it was a very ugly thing, if the Pope's claim to supremacy be true. So, of course, the fact that Dioscorus excommunicated the Pope was to be cut out of the sentence passed on him; so the forger who made the copy cut it out accordingly.

But if you cut something out of a sentence, it is only fair to put something else in, to make up the difference. The forger felt this, and he acted accordingly; for in that "cooked" copy we find things that are not in the original sentence, in the acts of the council. In the copy of Pope Leo we find the Pope declared to be "the head of the Universal Church," and the "door keeper of the kingdom of heaven;"* of which things there is not one word in the genuine copy of the sentence in the acts of the council.

But, now, our readers may ask us, how do we know which copy of this sentence on Dioscorus, of Alexandria, is the true and genuine one? How do we know that the copy, which Pope Leo I. sent to France, is not really the true one?

We are prepared to answer this question. Pope Nicolas I., who lived in the ninth century, in his 8th epistle (which we have so often quoted before) quotes that sentence passed on Dioscorus; and he quotes from it the very words which are not in the copy sent by Pope Leo I. to France. "He pronounced an excommunication against the holy Pope Leo."† And Pope Adrian, who succeeded Nicolas in that ninth century, in his letter to Ignatius, Patriarch of Constantinople, quotes the same thing from that sentence in the very same words in which it is now found in the Latin translation of the sentence, as it stands in the acts of the council. "He also presumed to pronounce an excommunication against the most holy and blessed Leo, Archbishop of great Rome."‡

So it is past all question that the sentence as it stands, in the acts of the council, with the mention of this excommunication in it, is the true and genuine sentence passed on Dioscorus, who, it is clear, did excommunicate Pope Leo, and, therefore, the copy of this sentence, which Pope Leo I. is said to have sent the bishops of France, is a false copy, altered by some forger. It is falsified in leaving out the mention of this excommunication, and it is falsified also in bringing in the Pope as the head of the Universal Church, and the doorkeeper of the kingdom of heaven.

Who falsified and "cooked" that copy? Was it Pope Leo I. in the fifth century? We do not think it was. It is true, the Popes took to forging very early. Pope Zozimus, and Pope Boniface, and Pope Celestine, in the beginning of the fifth century, were all concerned in a forgery plot. But many of the early Popes were free from such wicked practices; and none, perhaps, was less likely to be guilty of such a thing than Pope Leo I. It is clear that the copy of the sentence which Pope Nicolas and Pope Adrian had at Rome, in the ninth century, was the true one, having all about the excommunication in it; and, therefore, it is plain that Pope Leo had not cut the excommunication out of the copy belonging to the popes at Rome. What then are we to think of that copy which Pope Leo I. is said to have sent to the bishops of France, which has not the excommunication in it? Why, simply this, that since the ninth century, some one has made free with the epistles of Pope Leo, and "cooked" them. Some one who copied out Pope Leo's epistles since, the ninth century, has cut out all about the excommunication, and put in all about the Pope being head of the Universal Church. This is a great fact to know, for it is one which throws light on a great many other facts of the same kind. When we read other epistles of Pope Leo, and find in them other mentions of the Pope being the head of the Church, we are to remember that we have not the actual letters which

Pope Leo wrote; we have only copies which some one else made of those letters, 400 or 500 years after Pope Leo was dead; and we have proof above, that the person who made those copies had a trick of sticking into Pope Leo's letters, that the Pope was head of the Church, when Pope Leo himself, had written no such thing; and, therefore, whenever we find any such thing in Pope Leo's letters as we now have them, it is but a piece of ordinary prudence to suspect that it was the forger who put that in, and not Pope Leo. And this is what every one should keep in mind who reads the writings of the early Popes, as we now have them. All these writings have come to us through the hands of unscrupulous forgers; all the oldest copies that we have of those writings, were made in ages when forgery was thought to be good service to God; and we must read and examine them with due caution accordingly.

Now for another letter of the same Pope Leo (19th Labbe and Coss. vol. iv., p. 38.), written to the Emperor Theodosius. We have two copies of this letter also, the second being at page 43. By a happy mistake, these two copies were formerly mistaken for two different letters; and, therefore, both have been preserved, so that we can compare them. But they are clearly two different copies of the same letter, as Labbe and Cossart admit; and the latter, they say, does not agree with itself, so we take it to be the cooked one: the first and genuine one begins thus:—"From the letters of your excellency, which long since you sent to the See of the blessed Apostle Peter, for your love of the Catholic faith, we have received so great confidence that truth and peace will be defended by you. . . ."

Now, mark how the forger transformed this in the other copy:—"In councils celebrated formerly and from the beginning, we have received such confidence from the blessed Peter, chief of the Apostles, that we have authority for defending the truth by our peace. . . ."

Observe that in the genuine letter the Pope, derives his confidence from the emperor, and it is the emperor who defends the truth. This was a most common and usual way for the early Popes to write to the emperors, of which we have many instances in their genuine letters; but this would not serve the forger; so he altered it to say, that the Pope derived his authority from Peter, the prince of Apostles, and that the Pope was the defender of the truth.

It is worth observing that this forged passage, beginning "olim et ab initio," was a favourite one with the forgers. We meet it in several of the forged decretal epistles; and we have now good reason to suspect it when we meet it in Popes' epistles, which have hitherto passed for pure and uncorrupted.

But it is not only Popes' epistles that have been thus cooked. General councils have been treated in the same way. Cardinal Baronius and Binius have put into the General Council of Chalcedon a whole act about Domnus, a deprived bishop, all of which is forged. This act is not found in the original Greek copies; and it provides for the maintenance of this Domnus, whereas the 5th general council has actually put it on record that this Domnus was dead years before that Council of Chalcedon was held! Where did they get this act? They got it where plenty of such things have been got. "This act is written in an old Latin copy in the Vatican." Such old copies have been fitly called "true Gibbonites, who come to impose on us with mouldy bread and tattered shoes."

In like manner have the canons of the great Council of Nice, which all true Christians reverence, been forged and corrupted at Rome. This we may return to some other time.

We have said enough to put our readers on their guard, about authorities produced in favour of Rome from these ancient writings. But nothing we can say in so short a compass can give any idea of the vast extent to which this system of corrupting and "cooking" the genuine writings of antiquity has been carried; or of the necessity which yet exists for the learned directing their attention to this. Forged writings have, to a great extent, been detected; though even here something certainly remains to be done. But in detecting the forged passages which have been inserted into genuine writings, comparatively little has yet been done. This task, indeed, can never be perfectly performed; but each additional step that can be made in it, puts us more upon our guard against being deceived by such wicked arts.

We have ourselves spent much time and labour in this examination; and we have reason to believe that we shall be able to show, that all the passages in favour of the Pope's supremacy, which are found in even those epistles of the early Popes, which yet pass for genuine, were either put therein by the forgers, or stand in so great suspicion of having been so put there, that no reasonable man can put any confidence in them. What we have thus collected is too long for a journal like ours; but if these papers should come to be published in a separate form, the proof of what we now say may be given to the world.

Again we call on our readers to remember the prophetic words of St. Clement in his genuine epistle, "Search into

the Holy Scriptures, which are the true words of the Holy Ghost; ye know that there is nothing wicked or forged written in them."

THE VARIATIONS OF ROMANISM.

It is a favourite boast of Roman Catholic controversial writers, that their Church is "one and unchangeable," and they are fond of contrasting the immutability of her doctrine with the variations which they say have taken place in the opinions of rival communions. It becomes, then, an important question to ask, are there grounds for this boast? Is it a fact that the Church of Rome has never varied in her doctrines or teaching?

In the first article of our last number, we took some pains to compare the doctrines of the Council of Trent with those taught by the Church of Rome in earlier times; and we there named several subjects with reference to which it can be proved that a marked change has taken place in her teaching. We could easily add to the list there given, but we wish now to speak of the change that has taken place in Romish teaching since the Council of Trent; and which is steadily going on in our own day, and before our very eyes. Some of our Roman Catholic readers may be surprised at being told, not only that the doctrines of their Church have changed, but that they are still in process of changing; and people in general find it hard to understand that a change has taken place in the opinions of any body, if they do not hear of any violent schism in it. But the case is just like that of a man whom we are in the habit of meeting every day; his personal appearance seems the same one day as it did the day before, and we take no notice of any alteration; while yet, probably, another person, who should meet the same man after the absence of a few years, would at once be struck by a visible and marked change in his appearance. Now, we assert that, just in the same manner, there has been a progressive change—silent and gradual, but steady—in the doctrinal teaching of the Church of Rome; and that this change is going on now as steadily and as rapidly as ever. The Fathers of Trent taught and believed many things for which we can find no warrant, either in Scripture or in the writings of the early Fathers; but, then, again, there are many things taught and believed in the Church of Rome at present, for which there is just as little warrant in the Council of Trent. We are sure that any one who will take up any of the popular books of devotion in use among Roman Catholics, will find in them a number of statements of facts and doctrines for which it is just as hard to find any foundation in the teaching of the Council of Trent, as it is for the Tridentine doctors to find a foundation in Scripture for their decrees. Nor is the change which has taken place confined to single doctrines merely—such as that of the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin; a doctrine which the Council of Trent did not venture to assert, but which is now generally believed by Roman Catholics. There is a far more fundamental difference—one touching the very question of the rule of faith. We assert, and hope to prove to the satisfaction of our readers, that there is not a greater difference on the subject of the rule of faith between the teaching of the Church of England and that of the Council of Trent, than there is between that of the Council of Trent and of modern Roman Catholic divines.

We have now lying before us the third edition of a Roman Catholic book of devotion, called "All for Jesus, or the Easy Ways of Divine Love," by the Very Rev. F. Faber, superior of the London Oratory. As this Mr. Faber was originally a member of the Church of England, it may, perhaps, be imagined that he may not be accurately acquainted with the doctrines of his new Church, and that the sentiments he expresses may not be fully in accordance with her teaching. We think it well, then, to begin by telling our readers how our attention was drawn to the book; and when we add, that it appears from the preface to this third edition that it has received the revision of one of the Roman Catholic bishops, no doubt can remain that it is in accordance with the belief of a large number, if not of the majority, of Roman Catholics of the present day.

It was in preparing another article for our present number, that we had occasion (see page 67) to refer to the *Tablet*, of last 17th December; and, in glancing through its columns, we chanced to meet with an article containing bitter complaints of the silence observed by Protestants with regard to Roman Catholic books of theology.

"The Oratorians write books of the most splendid genius, and commanding power; books, for instance, like Father Faber's 'All for Jesus,' of which two large editions were exhausted in one month; but not a hint is whispered of it in the Anglican journals. They dare not review it; dare not even allude to it. They do what they can; and try to ignore what all the world is telling about. A feeble sneer at oratorian devotions, in the *Guardian*, or *English Churchman*, is all the opposition they venture to make; because to say more would excite curiosity and be dangerous."

On reading the above, it struck us, that we had been as guilty as the *Times*, or the *Guardian*, or the *English Churchman*, in omitting to give our readers any account of the work of Father Faber, here alluded to; but the cause of our silence was certainly not want of courage to review the book, but (shall we confess it?) sheer ignorance

* Sanctus ac Beatissimus papa caput universalis Ecclesie Leo, ecclesiis regni janitor nuncupatur.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ii., p. 1,419.
† Excommunicationem in sanctum Leonem papam dicitur.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 308.
‡ Præsumptum enim et excommunicationem dicere adversus sanctissimum et beatissimum magnæ Romæ Leonem.—Labbe and Coss., vol. viii., p. 1,014.

* Marginal note, p. 43. Labbe and Coss., vol. iv.
† Literis Clementis v. e. t. r. e. quas dudum ad beati Petri Apostoli sedem per Catholicos fidei amore missis, tantam fiduciam sumptibus defendenda per vos veritatis et pacis.
‡ Olim et ab initio in conciliis celebratis tantam nos percipimus a beatissimo Petro Apostolorum principe fiduciam, ut auctoritatem habeamus ad veritatem pro nostra pace defendendam.—Labbe and Coss., vol. iv., p. 42.

of its existence. It was certainly shameful in us to be ignorant of what "all the world was talking about;" and, yet, we think "all the world" must bear some share of the blame for not having talked a little louder.

We have, then, accordingly, made ourselves acquainted with Father Faber's book, and have found in it a number of curious things, some of which we hope to lay before our readers hereafter. Any one who turns over its pages will find in it a number of statements of doctrines and facts, which would have been as new to the Fathers of Trent as they are to ourselves. But we must reserve to another occasion an examination of the particular facts and doctrines to which we allude; what we have at present to do is to state the authority on which they rest.

Any question as to particular doctrines, is subordinate to the general question concerning the rule of faith; for any difference on this subject will be sure to give rise to differences respecting particular doctrines. Thus, most of the differences between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, take their rise in their differences as to the rule of faith. The Church of England and the Council of Trent agree in taking for their rule the Word of God, whether as communicated by our Lord himself to the Apostles, or as written by them under the dictation of the Holy Ghost. But they differ on the point where this Word of God is to be found. The Church of England asserts that it is all contained in Scripture; the Council of Trent asserts that the teaching of our Lord and his Apostles has been also handed down in the tradition of the Church. And so it is very natural that the Church of Rome should believe many things, which the Church of England does not believe; for the fundamental principle of the former is, that there are some parts of our Saviour's teaching handed down by tradition, which are not recorded in Scripture; and such things the Church of Rome is bound to believe, while the Church of England denies their existence.

But, now, Mr. Faber, and those Roman Catholics who agree with him, are not satisfied with the double rule of faith adopted by the Council of Trent. He teaches many doctrines, of which the Council of Trent makes no mention; and the reason is, that he not only takes for his rule of faith the Word of God, as communicated by our Lord to the Apostles, and handed down in the Church by Scripture or tradition, but he further receives, as having a right to govern his belief, *revelations*, asserted to be made by our Lord, to different individuals, from time to time. We copy, almost at random, a few specimens of the proofs Mr. Faber advances for his assertions; but there are scarcely half a dozen consecutive pages in the book which would not furnish us with quotations as much to our purpose.

"Our Lord told St. Gertrude, that as often as any one says to God—my love, or my sweetest, or my best beloved, and the like, with a devout intention, he receives a pledge of his salvation, in virtue of which, if he perseveres, he shall receive in heaven a special privilege of the same sort, as the special grace which St. John the Evangelist, the beloved disciple, had on earth."—Page 60.

"Our Lord said to St. Teresa, that one soul, not a saint, but *seeking* perfection, was more precious to him than thousands living common lives."—Page 117.

"St. Gertrude was divinely instructed, that as often as the angelic salutation is devoutly recited by the faithful on earth, three efficacious streamlets proceed from the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, most sweetly penetrating the Blessed Virgin's heart. Then, from her heart gain." &c.—Page 104.

"St. Matilda ventured to say to Jesus, 'Lord, if Gertrude's life is so perfect, how is it she cannot bear the defects of others, and exaggerates them so much?' Our Lord, with admirable sweetness, replied—'It is because she cannot bear the least stain on her own heart, that she feels so keenly the failings of her neighbours.'"—P. 323.

"Once more, let us listen to the testimony of God himself. [!] A holy man pressed God, in prayer, to reveal to him what it was in which His Divine Majesty took so much pleasure in His beloved Gertrude. God vouchsafed to reply, &c."—P. 323.

"On another occasion, when St. Gertrude was suffering one night from weakness, she ate some grapes, with the mental intention of refreshing our Lord in herself. He, on his part, took this as a royal gift, and said to her—'In this I confess that you have recompensed me for the bitter potion which I, for your sake, took upon the cross; for now I suck unspeakable sweetness out of your heart; for with how much greater purity of intention you recreate your body for my glory, with so much the more sweetness do I acknowledge myself recreated in your soul.'"—P. 174.

"Among the revelations made to Sister Francesca, it was told her that immense numbers of souls issued from Purgatory on the evening of All Souls Day; and that they were mostly those who were near to glory among whom God distributed the suffrages of the Universal Church on that day."—P. 44.

"We find, from the revelations of St. Francesca, that among some hundreds of cases, by far the greater majority suffered [in Purgatory] thirty, forty, or sixty years. Here are some of the examples:—A holy bishop, for some negligence in his high office, had been in Purgatory fifty-nine years before he appeared to the servant of God; another bishop, so generous of his revenues that he was named the alms-giver, had been there five years, because

he wished for the dignity; another bishop had been forty; a priest, forty years, because through his negligence some sick persons had died without the sacraments; another, forty-five years, for inconsiderateness in his ministerial duties; a gentleman, fifty-nine years, for worldliness; another, sixty-four, for fondness for playing at cards for money; another, thirty-five years, for worldliness. Bishops seem, upon the whole, according to her revelations, to remain longest there, and to be visited with the extreme of rigour."—P. 367.

At pp. 356, &c., there is a passage too long to extract, from which it appears that the true nature of the sufferings of Purgatory was first made known, by revelations, to St. Catherine of Genoa, in, we believe, the sixteenth century.

The quotations we have given, and which could be multiplied indefinitely, are enough to show that Mr. Faber is not content with the Council of Trent's double rule of faith; but that he regulates his belief by a triple standard—Scripture, and tradition, and modern revelations. These last, it will be perceived, he cites as decisive arguments; nay, calls on his readers to listen to them as the testimony of God himself. And it is certain that Mr. Faber is not singular in this, for most Roman Catholic books of devotion, not intended to be placed in Protestant hands, act in precisely the same manner. But, perhaps, it will be said, the belief in these revelations is optional; the Church has not decided; and one may be a loyal member of the Roman Catholic Church, and yet refuse to give credence to the dreams of Francesca or of Gertrude. But this is not a subject on which the Church of Rome can, with any consistency, allow of a difference of opinion among her members. Her controversialists correctly remind us that it is the prime duty of every Christian to give implicit assent to the Word of God, no matter by what channel made known to him. He must, of course, receive everything contained in Scripture; but if any part of the Divine teaching has been conveyed by tradition, he is equally bound to make himself acquainted with it, and to give his assent to it. And, just in like manner, if God has made any new revelations to St. Gertrude or St. Francesca, in the same manner as He did to St. John or St. Paul, it is no longer a matter of indifference whether Christians receive them or not; they are bound to receive them with precisely the same affection and reverence with which they receive the books of Scripture. The Church of Rome need be at no loss (if her pretensions be well founded) to distinguish true from false revelations: for what is the use of an infallible guide, if this guide is unable to distinguish the revelations of God from the dotings of silly old women? When, then, we see some members of the Church of Rome rejecting such tales as we have quoted from Mr. Faber, and others governing their belief by them, it is manifest that that Church is only dissembling a schism, when she tolerates difference of opinion within her communion, on a question so momentous as that of the rule of faith. There is not a greater difference between the Church of England rule (Scripture alone) and the Tridentine rule (Scripture and tradition) than there is between this latter rule and the new Oxford rule—Scripture, and tradition, and modern revelations.

When once this new rule is adopted, there is an end of the boast that the Church of Rome is the old Church and teaches the old doctrines. Now, while the Church of England is simple enough to be satisfied with the old religion, such as Peter and Paul taught it, and their hearers received, the modern Church of Rome boasts of a religion, with the latest improvements, by Teresa, and Catherine, of Genoa; and, no doubt, still further additions may be expected to be made to their creed by further revelations, from time to time. We have said that all parties in the Church of Rome do not equally assent to the stories we are speaking of. The party, however, who hold views so fatal to their Church's claims of unity of doctrine, has gained great predominance of late years, chiefly through the exertions of the Oxford converts to Romanism, who have almost all embraced the most extreme views in their new communion; and to whom it is owing that a great change has taken place in our time in the tone of doctrine held by Roman Catholics in these kingdoms. This may be accounted for by the manner in which these conversions were generally made. The persons alluded to had been principally influenced by the use of arguments borrowed from infidels, and had been brought to believe that if they used their reason and private judgment in religious matters, the inevitable result would be hopeless scepticism. Startled at such a result, they hastily threw themselves blindfold into the arms of the guide who promised to conduct them to truth; ready to receive, with indiscriminating credulity, all that this guide might be pleased to set before them; nay, persuaded that the greater their readiness to believe without or against evidence, the higher their faith. We are bound to believe these gentlemen, or, at least, the majority of them,

to be sincere in their profession; and, yet, if there were any of them who remained infidels at heart, we can imagine no more subtle or more effectual way for leading others into infidelity than that which they have adopted; yielding equally ready assent to the miracles of Scripture, and the legends of mediæval saints; accepting with equal reverence the revelations made to Paul and John, and those made to St. Francesca or St. Catherine.

There was only one point which their faith hesitated to embrace. Some of them were acquainted with the writings of the primitive Fathers; accordingly, they said to their new spiritual guide, propound to us authoritatively any doctrine you please, and we are prepared to accept it; only you will do us a favour if you will not oblige us to assert that the primitive Church taught the same. We will submit if you insist on it; but we confess we find this a little too strong. Do us the favour of permitting us to call your doctrines a development* of primitive Christianity; if you will only grant this, ecclesiastical history will present no difficulties to us; it will be easy to believe that your doctrines resemble those of the early Church as much as an oak resembles an acorn, or a butterfly resembles a caterpillar.

The prayer was granted—the converts were admitted on their own terms; yet, we are sure many of the old Roman Catholic divines must see with consternation the revolution which their new allies are making in their theology. We notice, for example, that Professor Murray, of Maynooth, in the preface to the last volume of his Theological Essays, seems not a little discontented with the extreme views of his new converts, who suddenly became wiser than their teachers.

"I shall not be at all surprised to find myself denounced by certain doctors of the new theology as a *heretic*, for some expressions in the preceding paragraph; just as one of my learned colleagues (a professor of the *old* theology) was denounced as a *Protestant*, for saying, of Lord Jeffrey, in the 'Dublin Review,' for last July, that he was not only a great, but a *good* man. Now-a-days there are a few individuals who, with their heads hardly dry from the waters of baptism, come out with their frantic and infallible theories, and denounce every man as unsound in the faith who does not square his language to their consecrated standard of speech."—Vol. iv., page 9.

We pity poor Dr. Murray, for we greatly fear his lamentations are in vain; and that his "old theology" is in a fair way of being superseded by the "new theology" of his dangerous associates.

We call, then, on our Roman Catholic readers to make their choice between the old religion and the new. Will they be satisfied with the doctrine of the Council of Trent, that the Word of God was completed in the teaching of our Lord and his Apostles? Will they be content to believe as Peter and Paul taught, and as the early Church believed? or will they embrace the new Oxford Divinity, that the doctrine of the primitive Church requires to be *developed*; and that to the revelation of St. John, which closed the canon of Scripture, must be added the revelations of St. Francesca, St. Gertrude, and St. Catherine?

THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

THOUGH we have, from time to time, alluded to the important subject which stands at the head of this article, we believe we have not yet considered it fully in our pages, either in a theological or a historical point of view; both of which are, we think, well deserving of attention; forming, as this doctrine undoubtedly does, one of the most striking points of distinction between the two Churches of England and Rome.

We must begin by saying a word upon the true nature and limit of the controversy between them.

The real point at issue is not, whether it be right or wrong to honour or commemorate the saints; but whether Roman Catholics are right or wrong in *invoking their aid* in the solemn offices of *prayer*—which Protestants call *saint-worship*.

So far is it from being true that the Church of England disregards or dishonours the true saints of the primitive Church, that any one who will take the trouble to look through the Book of Common Prayer, according to the use of the United Church of England and Ireland, will find not only special offices (collects, lessons, epistles, and gospels) for St. Stephen, St. John the Evangelist, St. Andrew, St. Thomas, St. Matthias, St. Mark, St. Philip and St. James, St. John the Baptist, St. Peter, St. James the Apostle, St. Bartholomew, St. Matthew, St. Michael and all Angels, St. Luke, St. Simon and St. Jude, and the Conversion of St. Paul, but days actually set apart to commemorate the Annunciation, and also the Purification, of the Blessed Virgin Mary—enough, one would think, to refute the calumny, so often reiterated by Romish controversialists against Protestants, that they revile the Blessed Virgin, and treat her as an ordinary woman.

They will also find, if they examine the order for evening prayer, in the same book, that the "Magnificat," or

* Could this have been St. Vincent de Paul, who is recorded by his contemporaries to have been a very agreeable man, only that he cheated at cards?

† Little evidence is given to such stories by the old Roman Catholics, appears from the quotation we have already made from Cassander (see page 65). He pronounces the existence of several popular saints uncertain, because they are known to us *only by revelation*. But if he thought these alleged revelations to be authentic, what greater certainty could he, or any one else, have than the Word of God himself?

* The following curious passage from Mr. Faber, p. 180, is a good illustration of the diversity of opinions, in the Church of Rome, and of the notion now prevalent, that the farther we come away from the Apostles' times the nearer we get to true Christianity. "In like manner, Schram, in his Mystical Theology, censures, as almost heretical, ejaculations which St. Francis, of Sales, quotes with tenderness and relish. Yet, in doctrinal matters, it may be safer for us to follow the colder and more cautious author. Besides he wrote later."